



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                       | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/717,412                            | 11/18/2003  | Michael H. McLemon   | MWS-033             | 7251             |
| 74321                                 | 7590        | 11/27/2007           | EXAMINER            |                  |
| LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP/THE MATHWORKS |             |                      | SALOMON, PHENUEL S  |                  |
| One Post Office Square                |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
| Boston, MA 02109-2127                 |             |                      | 2178                |                  |
|                                       |             |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |
|                                       |             |                      | 11/27/2007          | PAPER            |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|                              |                    |                 |
|------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | Application No.    | Applicant(s)    |
|                              | 10/717,412         | MCLERNON ET AL. |
|                              | Examiner           | Art Unit        |
|                              | Phenuel S. Salomon | 2178            |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 September 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                                   2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3,4,6-29,34 and 36-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,3,4,6-29,34 and 36-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to the amendment file on, September 17, 2007.
2. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-17, 19-29, 34, 36-40, 42-45, 47 and 48 are amended, claims 2, 5, 30-33 and 35 are canceled and claims 1,3-4, 6-29,34, and 36-48 are pending.
3. The objection to the specification has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.
4. The rejection of claims 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.
5. The rejection of claims 1,3-5, 9-13,18-19, 23, and 30-31 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Fitzpatrick et al. (US 6,877,138 B2) has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
6. The rejection of claims 47-48 under U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Miloushev et al. (US 2002/0069400 A1) has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1, 3-5, 9-13, 18-19, 23, 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Fritzpatrick et al. (US 6,877,138 B2) in view of Budinsky et al. (US 6,407,753).

Claim 1: Fritzpatrick discloses a computer-readable medium holding computer executable instructions, the medium comprising:

instructions for selecting at least one characteristic in intersection of characteristics (col. 2, lines 19-21);

instructions for receiving a designation at least one destination block in said block diagram; and (col. 1, lines 42-49); and

instructions for propagating said selected at least one characteristic to said destination block (col. 2, lines 1-14), but does not explicitly disclose

instructions for determining an intersection of characteristics common to said plurality of source blocks. However, Budinsky discloses an integration process where the definitions of the entities to be integrated are examined and determine which of their elements match (col. 1, lines 58-67) [matching these elements implies that the characteristics are common or intersect).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include intersection of characteristics in Fritzpatrick. One would have been motivated to do so in order to quickly deploy pertinent characteristics among blocks.

Claim 3: Fritzpatrick and Budinsky disclose the medium as in claim 1 above, Fritzpatrick further discloses comprising: instructions for creating a data structure for the selected at least one characteristic in said data structure having a plurality of substructures (col. 4, lines 23-26).

Claim 4: Fritzpatrick and Budinsky disclose the medium as in claim 1 above, Fritzpatrick further discloses said selecting at least one characteristic involves the use of a category list, said at least one characteristic associated with at least one category of said category list (col. 4, lines 4-9).

Claim 9: Fritzpatrick and Budinsky disclose the medium as in claim 1 above, Fritzpatrick further discloses propagating said at least one characteristic involves propagating less than all characteristics in intersection of characteristic (col. 2, lines 19-29).

Claim 10: Fritzpatrick and Budinsky disclose the medium as in claim 1 above, Fritzpatrick further discloses propagating involves propagating less than all characteristics in said intersection of characteristics, as specified by a user (col. 2, lines 19-29).

Claim 11: Fritzpatrick and Budinsky disclose a medium as in claim 1 above, Fritzpatrick further discloses selecting involves selecting said characteristics to be propagated from a Graphical User Interface (col. 2, lines 19-27).

Claim 12: Fritzpatrick and Budinsky disclose the medium as in claim 1 above, Fritzpatrick further discloses said selecting involves selecting said at least one characteristics to be

propagated by the use of a short key (col. 4, lines 13-21).

Claim 13: Fritzpatrick and Budinsky disclose the medium as in claim 1 above, Fritzpatrick further discloses propagating involves propagating less than all characteristics in said intersection of characteristics, as automatically determined based on characteristics of said plurality of source blocks and characteristics of said destination block (abstract, lines 3-15).

Claim 18: Fritzpatrick and Budinsky disclose the medium as in claim 1 above, Fritzpatrick further discloses said at least one characteristic is a parameter (col. 2, lines 1-13).

Claim 19: Fritzpatrick and Budinsky disclose the medium as in claim 1 above, Fritzpatrick further discloses said at least one characteristic is one of a component, block diagram attribute or property of source block (col. 2, lines 19-27).

Claim 23: Fritzpatrick and Budinsky disclose a medium as in claim 1 above, Fritzpatrick further discloses said destination block does not have said characteristic prior to said propagating (col. 2, lines 34-47).

Claim 2: Fritzpatrick discloses a medium as in claim 1 above, but does not explicitly disclose said source block comprises a plurality of source blocks and further comprising, before said step of selecting at least one characteristic, the step of determining an intersection of characteristics common to said plurality of source blocks and wherein said step of selecting at least one

characteristic involves a selection from said intersection. However, Budinsky discloses a process of integrating entities.. (col. 1, lines 58-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include characteristics common to both source and destination blocks in Fritzpatrick. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently propagate attributes to different blocks of the system.

Claim 8: Fritzpatrick discloses a medium as in claim 1 above, but does not explicitly disclose the step of undoing said propagating step by returning the characteristics of said destination block to a condition existing prior to said propagating step. However, Budinsky discloses a multi-level undo/redo and direct rules manipulation (col. 3, lines 28-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include undoing propagating characteristics in Fritzpatrick. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently reinstate the affected block to its original state.

Claim 24: Fritzpatrick discloses a system comprising:

A memory (ram)configured to hold a block diagram having a plurality of blocks (col. 4, lines 10-20); and

a processor configured to:

selecting at least one characteristic from said intersection (col. 2, lines 19-21);

propagating said selected at least one characteristic to said destination block (col. 2, lines 1-14), but does not explicitly discloses

to determine an intersection of characteristics common to a plurality of source blocks.

However, Budinsky discloses an integration process where the definitions of the entities to be integrated are examined and determine which of their elements match (col. 1, lines 58-67) [matching these elements implies that the characteristics are common or intersect). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include intersection of characteristics in Fritzpatrick. One would have been motivated to do so in order to quickly deploy pertinent characteristics among blocks.

Claim 25: Fritzpatrick discloses a computer-readable medium holding computer executable instructions, the medium comprising:

instructions for receiving a designation of a source block in a block diagram; and (col. 1, lines 54-57);

instructions for selecting at least one characteristic in intersection of characteristics (col. 2, lines 19-21);

instructions for propagating said selected at least one characteristic to said destination block (col. 2, lines 1-14), but does not explicitly disclose

instructions for receiving a designation of a plurality of destination blocks in a block diagram; and

instructions for determining an intersection of characteristics common to said source block and said plurality of destination blocks.

However, Budinsky discloses:

instructions for receiving a designation of a plurality of destination blocks in a block diagram; and (col. 1, lines 42-49)

instructions for determining an intersection of characteristics common to said source block and said plurality of destination blocks (col. 1, lines 58-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the above steps in Fritzpatrick. One would have been motivated to do so in order to quickly deploy the pertinent characteristic among blocks.

Claim 34: Fritzpatrick discloses a method comprising the steps of:

designating at least one source graphical object (col. 1, lines 54-57);  
selecting at least one characteristic of said source graphical object (col. 2, lines 19-21);  
designating at least one destination graphical object (col. 1, lines 42-49); and  
propagating said characteristic to said destination graphical object (col. 2, lines 1-14), but does not explicitly discloses a software diagram environment, a medium holding electronic device executable steps for a method. However, Budinsky discloses a software tools that are used for software development (col. 10 , lines 16-32). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the language for specifying diagram elements in Fritzpatrick. One would have been motivated to do so in order to facilitate a better visualization of the process of data transfer between the blocks.

Claim 35: Fritzpatrick discloses a medium as in claim 34 above, but does not explicitly disclose said software diagram environment is a unified modeling language diagram. However, Budinsky

discloses the use of Unified Modeling Language (col. 2, lines 30-36). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use Unified Modeling Language in Fritzpatrick. One would have been motivated to do so in order to specify a concrete graphical notation for abstract models of various system views.

Claim 26: Fritzpatrick discloses an apparatus comprising:

means for selecting at least one characteristic in said intersection of characteristics (col. 2, lines 19-21);

means for receiving a designation of at least one destination block in said block diagram; and (col. 1, lines 42-49); and

propagating said characteristic to said destination block (col. 2, lines 1-14), but does not explicitly disclose:

means for determining an intersection of characteristics common to a first source block and a second source block in a block diagram. However, Budinsky discloses an integration process where the definitions of the entities to be integrated are examined and determine which of their elements match (col. 1, lines 58-67) [matching these elements implies that the characteristics are common or intersect). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include intersection of characteristics in Fritzpatrick. One would have been motivated to do so in order to quickly deploy pertinent characteristics among blocks.

Claim 27: Fritzpatrick and Budinsky disclose the apparatus as in claim 26 above, Fritzpatrick

further discloses said at least one characteristic is a parameter (col. 2, lines 1-13).

Claim 28: Fritzpatrick and Budinsky disclose the apparatus as in claim 26 above, Fritzpatrick further discloses said at least one characteristic is one of a component block diagram attribute or property of a source block (col. 2, lines 19-27).

Claim 29: Fritzpatrick and Budinsky disclose the apparatus as in claim 26 above, Fritzpatrick further discloses said step of selecting involves selecting said characteristics to be propagated from a Graphical User Interface (col. 2, lines 19-27).

Claim 36: Fritzpatrick discloses a computer-readable medium holding computer executable instructions, the medium comprising:

instructions for selecting at least one characteristic in intersection of characteristics (col. 2, lines 19-21);

instructions for receiving a designation at least one destination component in said circuit diagram; and (col. 1, lines 42-49); and

instructions for propagating said selected at least one characteristic to said destination block (col. 2, lines 1-14), but does not explicitly disclose

instructions for determining an intersection of characteristics common to a plurality of source components in a circuit diagram. However, Budinsky discloses an integration process where the definitions of the entities to be integrated are examined and determine which of their elements match (col. 1, lines 58-67) [matching these elements implies that the characteristics are

common or intersect). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include intersection of characteristics in Fritzpatrick. One would have been motivated to do so in order to quickly deploy pertinent characteristics among blocks.

Claim 37: Fritzpatrick discloses a computer-readable medium holding computer executable instructions, the medium comprising:

instructions for selecting at least one characteristic in intersection of characteristics (col. 2, lines 19-21);

instructions for receiving a designation at least one destination component in said mechanical diagram; and (col. 1, lines 42-49); and

instructions for propagating said selected at least one characteristic to said destination block (col. 2, lines 1-14), but does not explicitly disclose

instructions for determining an intersection of characteristics common to a plurality of source components in a mechanical diagram. However, Budinsky discloses an integration process where the definitions of the entities to be integrated are examined and determine which of their elements match (col. 1, lines 58-67) [matching these elements implies that the characteristics are common or intersect). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include intersection of characteristics in Fritzpatrick. One would have been motivated to do so in order to quickly deploy pertinent characteristics among blocks.

Claim 38: Fritzpatrick discloses a computer-readable medium holding computer executable instructions, the medium comprising:

instructions for selecting at least one characteristic in intersection of characteristics (col. 2, lines 19-21);

instructions for receiving a designation at least one destination graphical element in said biological diagram; and (col. 1, lines 42-49); and

instructions for propagating said selected at least one characteristic to said destination graphical element (col. 2, lines 1-14), but does not explicitly disclose

instructions for determining an intersection of characteristics common to said plurality of source graphical elements in a biological diagram. However, Budinsky discloses an integration process where the definitions of the entities to be integrated are examined and determine which of their elements match (col. 1, lines 58-67) [matching these elements implies that the characteristics are common or intersect). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include intersection of characteristics in Fritzpatrick. One would have been motivated to do so in order to quickly deploy pertinent characteristics among blocks.

Claim 39: Fritzpatrick discloses a computer-readable medium holding computer executable instructions, the medium comprising:

instructions for selecting at least one characteristic in intersection of characteristics (col. 2, lines 19-21);

instructions for receiving a designation of at least one destination graphical elements in said network diagram; and (col. 1, lines 42-49); and

instructions for propagating said selected at least one characteristic to said at least one destination graphical element (col. 2, lines 1-14), but does not explicitly disclose instructions for determining an intersection of characteristics common to said plurality of source graphical elements in a network diagram. However, Budinsky discloses an integration process where the definitions of the entities to be integrated are examined and determine which of their elements match (col. 1, lines 58-67) [matching these elements implies that the characteristics are common or intersect). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include intersection of characteristics in Fritzpatrick. One would have been motivated to do so in order to quickly deploy pertinent characteristics among blocks.

9. Claims 7 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fritzpatrick. (US 6,877,138 B2) in view of Budinsky (US 6,407,753 B1) and in further view of Iriuchijima (US 6,070,006).

Claim 7: Fritzpatrick and Budinsky disclose a medium as in claim 1 above, but does not explicitly disclose said destination block is a subsystem block representing a plurality of lower-level blocks and said propagating is restricted to propagating to said subsystem block without propagating to said plurality of lower-level blocks. However, Iriuchijima discloses non-inheritance attributes from parent to child class (col. 2, lines 36-42). Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include propagation restriction in Fritzpatrick. One would have been motivated to do so in order to prevent propagation of attributes to block of different nature.

Claim 21: Fritzpatrick and Budinsky disclose a medium as in claim 1 above, but does not explicitly disclose said plurality of source blocks are predetermined members of a plurality of said destination blocks. However, Iriuchijima discloses inheritance attributes from parent to child class (col. 1, lines 36-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include predetermined member in Fritzpatrick. One would have been motivated to do so in order to quickly deploy attributes to blocks of the same nature.

10. Claims 6, 16-17, 20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fritzpatrick. (US 6,877,138 B2) in view of Budinsky (US 6,407,753 B1) and in further view of Dhond (US 6,195,092).

Claim 6: Fritzpatrick and Budinsky disclose a medium as in claim 1 above, wherein said destination block is a subsystem representing a plurality of blocks (col. 1, lines 58-61), but does not explicitly disclose said at least one characteristic is propagated to each of said plurality of blocks. However, Dhond discloses one or more graphical objects where attributes are being propagated (col. 6, lines 15-21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include characteristic propagation in

Fritzpatrick. One would have been motivated to do so in order to simultaneously edit or update multiple blocks attribute in one display.

Claim 16: Fritzpatrick and Budinsky disclose a medium as in claim 1 above, but does not explicitly disclose comprising instructions for determining which blocks of said block diagram have characteristics corresponding to the selected at least one characteristic in said selecting. However, Dhond discloses the selection of the attributes of the first graphical objects (col. 6, lines 1-14). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the step of determining which blocks corresponding to the at least one characteristic in Fritzpatrick. One would have been motivated to do so in order to accurately identify the associated blocks and thus assuring efficient attribute propagation.

Claim 17: Fritzpatrick and Budinsky disclose a medium as in claim 1 above, but does not explicitly disclose comprising instructions for determining which blocks of said block diagram have characteristics that could be propagated to said destination block. However, Dhond discloses the selection of the attributes of the first graphical objects (col. 6, lines 15-21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the step of determining which blocks corresponding to the at least one characteristic in Fritzpatrick. One would have been motivated to do so in order to accurately identify the associated blocks and thus assuring efficient attribute propagation.

Art Unit: 2178

Claim 20: Fritzpatrick and Budinsky disclose a medium as in claim 1 above, but does not explicitly disclose selecting at least one characteristic is performed before said designating at least one destination block. However, Dhond discloses the selection of the attributes of the first graphical objects (col. 6, lines 15-21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the step of selecting characteristic in Fritzpatrick. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently identify the associated source and destination objects.

Claim 22: Fritzpatrick and Budinsky disclose a medium as in claim 1 above, but does not explicitly disclose designation of at least one destination block is performed from a text-based list. However, Dhond discloses display of graphical objects within a spreadsheet-like graphical user interface (col. 6, lines 1-6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a text-based list of blocks in Fritzpatrick. One would have been motivated to do so in order to better facilitate the selection of block from a wide variety of choices.

11. Claims 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fritzpatrick. (US 6,877,138 B2) in view of Budinsky (US 6,407,753 B1) and in further view of Shudo et al (US 6,300,949 B1).

Claim 14: Fritzpatrick and Budinsky disclose the medium as in claim 1 above, but does not explicitly disclose comprising instructions storing information relating to propagating to enable

repeating said propagating. However, Shudo discloses stored attribute information for further propagating (col. 2, lines 1-30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include storing information relating to propagating step in Fritzpatrick. One would have been motivated to do so in order to facilitate a faster propagation of the same attribute on a larger scale.

Claim 15: Fritzpatrick and Budinsky disclose a medium as in claim 14 above, but does not explicitly disclose said storing comprises storing information relating to multiple iterations of said propagating. However, Shudo discloses stored attribute information for further propagating (col. 2, lines 18-30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include multiple iterations of propagating step in Fritzpatrick. One would have been motivated to do so in order to easily deploy the same attribute on a larger scale.

12. Claims 40-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fritzpatrick. (US 6,877,138 B2) in view of Zink et al (US 6,738,964 B1) and in further view of Budinsky (US 6,407,753 B1).

Claim 40: Fritzpatrick discloses a computer-readable medium holding computer executable instructions, the medium comprising:

instructions for selecting at least one characteristic of said intersection of characteristics (col. 2, lines 19-21)

instructions for receiving a designation at least one destination line associated with a third block and a fourth block of said block diagram; and (col. 1, lines 42-49); and

instructions for propagating said selected at least one characteristic to said destination line (col. 2, lines 1-14), but does not explicitly disclose:

instructions for determining an intersection of characteristics common to a plurality of source lines associated with a first block and a second block of a block diagram.

However, Zink discloses at least one source line associated with a first block and a second block of said block diagram (fig. 9) and Budinsky further discloses an integration process where the definitions of the entities to be integrated are examined and determine which of their elements match (col. 1, lines 58-67) [matching these elements implies that the characteristics are common or intersect). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Budinsky's intersection of characteristics and Zink's plurality of source lines in Fritzpatrick. One would have been motivated to do so in order to quickly deploy pertinent characteristics among blocks.

Claim 41: Fritzpatrick, Zink and Budinsky disclose the medium as in claim 40 above, but does not explicitly disclose said second block and said third block are the same block. However, Zink further discloses a plurality of blocks (fig. 9) (Examiner note: usage of the same block is inherent since they have the same characteristics). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the same two blocks in Fritzpatrick. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide a better system data filtering capability.

13. Claims 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fritzpatrick (US 6,877,138 B2) in view of Wold et al (US 5,386,568) and in further view of Budinsky (US 6,407,753 B1).

Claim 42: Fritzpatrick discloses a computer-implemented method comprising:

selecting at least one characteristic of said intersection of characteristics (col. 2, lines 19-21)

receiving a designation at least one destination block in a block diagram; and (col. 1, lines 42-49); and

propagating said selected at least one characteristic to the least one destination block (col. 2, lines 1-14), but does not explicitly disclose

determining an intersection of characteristics common to a plurality of source blocks in a block diagram. However, Wold discloses a plurality of source block in a block diagram (fig. 10a) and Budinsky discloses an integration process where the definitions of the entities to be integrated are examined and determine which of their elements match (col. 1, lines 58-67) [matching these elements implies that the characteristics are common or intersect]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include intersection of characteristics in Fritzpatrick. One would have been motivated to do so in order to quickly deploy pertinent characteristics among blocks.

Claim 43: Fritzpatrick, Wold and Budinsky disclose the method as in claim 42 above,

Fritzpatrick further discloses determining said at least one destination block in same block type as at least one source block in said plurality of source blocks (col. 2, lines 1-14); (Examiner note: source and destination blocks should be the same block type in order to share the same characteristic).

Claim 44: Fritzpatrick, Wold and Budinsky disclose the method as in claim 42 above, Fritzpatrick further discloses said at least one destination block is designated based on a second characteristic in said intersection of characteristics, said second characteristic matching a second characteristic of said at least one destination block (col.2, lines 19-27).

14. Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fritzpatrick. (US 6,877,138 B2) in view of Wold et al (US 5,386,568) and in further view of Santori (US 2003/0132964 A1).

Claim 45: Fritzpatrick and Budinsky and Wold disclose the method as in claim 44 above, but do not explicitly disclose said second characteristic indicates said at least one destination block is representative of a virtual subsystem. However, Santori discloses creating virtual instrumentation system (page 1, para [0009]). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include virtual subsystem in Fritzpatrick. One would have been motivated to do so in order to clearly identify characteristics propagation within block diagram environment.

15. Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fritzpatrick. (US 6,877,138 B2) in view of Wold et al (US 5,386,568) and in further view of Singh (US 2003/0132964 A1).

Claim 46: Fritzpatrick, Budinsky and Wold disclose the method as in claim 42 above, but do not explicitly disclose said at least one destination block is a subsystem representing a plurality of blocks and said at least one characteristic is propagated to each of said plurality of blocks in said subsystem. However, Singh discloses blocks can be interconnected to form a subsystem (page 1, para [0003]). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include subsystem in Fritzpatrick. One would have been motivated to do so in order to facilitate the distribution of characteristics among blocks in the subsystem.

16. Claims 47-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miloushev et al. (US 2002/0069400 A1) in view of Budinsky et al. (US 6,407,753).

Claim 47: Miloushev discloses a medium holding computer-executable instructions, the medium comprising:

selecting at least one characteristic in said intersection of characteristics, said first source block having said characteristic of a first value, said second source block having said characteristic of a second value (page 8, para [0142] and [0147]);  
instructions for receiving a designation of a first destination block and a second destination block in said block diagram (page 8, para [0142] and [0147]); and

instructions for propagating said selected at least one characteristic to said first destination block and said second destination block, said first value propagated to said first destination block and said second value propagated to said second destination block (page 8, para [0138]). But does not explicitly disclose

instructions for determining an intersection of characteristics common to a first source block and a second source block in a block diagram. However, Budinsky discloses an integration process where the definitions of the entities to be integrated are examined and determine which of their elements match (col. 1, lines 58-67) [matching these elements implies that the characteristics are common or intersect]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include intersection of characteristics in Miloushev. One would have been motivated to do so in order to quickly deploy pertinent characteristics among blocks.

Claim 48: Miloushev and Budinsky disclose the medium as in claim 47 above, Miloushev further discloses said propagating step determines said first destination block and said second destination block by the use of respective contexts relative to said first source block and said second source block (page 8, para [0138]).

#### *Response to Arguments*

17. Applicant's arguments filed on 09/21/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim1,3-4, 6-29, 34, and 36-48 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

18. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

19. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Reddy et al. (US 2003/0098880 A1) discloses system and apparatus for programming...

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phenuel S. Salomon whose telephone number is (571) 270-1699. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:00 A.M. to 4:00 P.M.(Alternate Friday Off) EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272 4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3800.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PSS  
11/19/2007

  
Stephen Hong  
Supervisory Primary Examiner